DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 235 533 CS 504 386

AUTHOR Hertzog, Robert L.; Bradac, James J.
TITLE Perceptions of Compliance-Gaining Situations: An Extended Analysis.
PUB DATE May 83
NOTE 46p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Communication Association (Dallas, TX, May 26-30, 1983).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Behavior Patterns; College Students; *Communication (Thought Transfer); *Communication Research; *Cooperation; *Environmental Influences; Higher Education; Human Relations; Interaction; *Interpersonal Communication; Perception; *Persuasive Discourse; Social Behavior
IDENTIFIERS *Compliance (Behavior)

ABSTRACT

To explore the impact of the environment on perceptions of compliance gaining situations, 97 university students were asked to recall and describe situations in which they had had to persuade someone to do something. Their descriptions of compliance gaining situations were then evaluated for similarity by three additional groups of students. The data, submitted to multidimensional scaling analysis, suggested that subject perceptions of these situations were influenced by five dimensions: (1) resistance to persuasion, (2) values/rules, (3) gender relevance/gender irrelevance, (4) dominance, and (5) long-term/short-term effects. (MM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Perceptions of Compliance-Gaining Situations: An Extended Analysis

ED235533

Robert L. Hertzog (Ph.D., University of Iowa, 1982) is an Assistant Professor in the Division of Humanities at the University of Maine, at Presque Isle, 211C Pullen Hall, Presque Isle, ME 04769

James J. Bradac (Ph.D., Northwestern University, 1970) is Professor of Communication Studies at the University of California, Santa Barbara, CA 93106

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robert L. Hertzog

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS 504386

Perceptions of Compliance-Gaining Situations: An Extended Analysis

Abstract

This study examines environmental influences on compliance-gaining by focusing on situation types. Much of the research in this area has examined compliance-gaining messages or strategies while paying scant attention to the complexities of situational variation. Three respondent samples judged compliance-gaining situations in terms of their similarities. The data were submitted to an MDS analysis to determine the dimensions characterizing respondents' perceptions. Four dimensions emerged from each sample. Three of these dimensions were replicated across at least two of the samples. The relationship of the present findings to previous research is discussed along with implications for future research.

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, communication research has produced a number of studies of compliance-gaining strategies (Falbo, 1977; Fitzpatrick & Winke, 1979; French & Raven, 1960; Hornstein, 1965; Lawler & Bacharach, 1976; Leibowitz, Bochner, Rawlins, & Eagle, 1977; Marwell & Schmidt, 1967; Roloff & Barnicott, 1979; Schenck-Hamlin, Wiseman, & Georgacrakos, 1982; Sillars, 1980; Wiseman & Schenck-Hamlin, 1981). However, few studies have examined <u>situations</u> in which compliance is sought. In daily interaction individuals confront a large number of situations which call for the use of strategies designed to gain compliance. What dimensions characterize and distinguish these situations? This question is central to the research reported here.

RELATED RESEARCH AND RATIONALE

Although compliance-gaining messages are normally contextualized, studies of the strategies used in forming these messages have employed an extremely limited range of situations. A standard procedure in research on compliance-gaining is to have respondents judge various strategies, usually according to the criterion: likelihood that the strategy would be used (or would be successful) in <u>this</u> situation. Thus, Berger, Gardner, Parks, Schulman, and Miller (1976) and Bradac, Schneider, Hemphill, and Tardy (1980) had respondents judge compliance-gaining messages in one context (a party). Roloff and Barnicott (1979), Lawler and Bacharach (1976), Lustig and King (1980) Hornstein (1965), Clark (1979), Jackson and Backus (1982), and Wiseman and Schenck-Hamlin (1981) presented subjects with four or fewer situations. The largest number of situations appears in a study by

McLaughlin, Cody, and Robey (1980). These researchers examined the effect of eight situational variations upon strategies used to resist compliance-gaining attempts. On the other hand, Falbo (1977) and Fitzpatrick and Winke (1979) employed no situations -- respondents were asked to judge strategies in vacu.

In addition to the small number of situations examined, with one exception (Cody & McLaughlin, 1980) the research has imposed upon respondents situations deemed meaningful by the researchers. For example, several researchers have imposed the situational distinction "long-term" versus "short-term consequences" (Jackson & Backus, 1982; Lustig & King, 1980; McLaughlin, Cody, & Robey, 1980), apparently on the basis of a saction offered in an initial study by Miller, Boster, Roloff, and Seibold (1977). This sort of imposition may be premature. Situational distinctions which are salient to researchers may not be salient to most persons in their everyday lives (cf. Forgas, 1976; Jackson & Bacus, 1982). It may be most fruitful at this point to allow respondents to define for themselves the dimensions of their social interactions which are meaningful and then to relate compliance-gaining strategies to these subjectively derived dimensions.

In recent years, a number of theorists have called for the development of empirically grounded taxonomies of social episodes, contexts, or situations (Argile & Little, 1972; Bowers, 1973; Endler & Magnusson, 1976; Mischel, 1973; Moos, 1973; Moos & Insel, 1974). Assuming that human activity is necessarily situated, these scholars argue that taxonomies of this sort will yield more accurate predic-

tions of human behavior than will further refinements of trait theories of personality. Some inital attempts to charaterize recurrent situations in persons' lives have been made in academic and in non-academic settings (Forgas, 1976, 1978; Magnusson, 1971). A few theorists have indicated the value of developing empirically grounded taxonomies of communication situations, i.e., situations in which messages are sent or exchanged (Bradac, 1982; Giles & Hewstone, 1982). And the research of Wish and associates on dimensions of interpersonal communication is worth noting in this regard, although much of this work has examined the structure of interpersonal exchanges rather than the structure of situations in which such exchanges are embedded (Wish, D'Andrade, & Goodnow II, 1980; Wish, Deutsch, & Kaplan, 1976; Wish & Kaplan, 1977). The structure of compliance-gaining situations remains virtually unexplored empirically (cf. Cody & McLaughlin, 1980). Rather obviously, compliance gaining is a pervasive and important type of human communicative activity, so the lack of empirical investigation of compliance-gaining situations constitutes a serious knowledge gap. Thus we suggest that it will be of considerable value to develop an empirically grounded taxonomy of interpersonal compliance-gaining episodes. Perhaps such a taxonomy will yield more consistent research results when used in studies of compliance-gaining strategies than will the traditional researcher generated situational distinctions.

Some studies which have focused upon compliance-gaining strategies have indirectly shed some light upon compliance-gaining situations. Miller et al. (1977) found that the level of intimacy in relationships and the short-term or long-term consequences of compliance

influenced the choice of compliance-gaining strategies. These researchers asked subjects to indicate which strategies (from a typology developed by Marwell & Schmitt, 1967) they would be likely to use in each of four situations. The results indicated that for intimate situations with short-term effects, altruism, altercasting, and liking were strategies most likely to be used, while for intimate situations with long-term effects, threat, promise, liking and expertise were indicated as most probable. Casual situations with long-term effects produced expertise, altruism, promise, liking, debt, and altercasting as the most frequently used strategies. In casual situations with short-term effects, liking was the only strategy consistently employed.

The Miller et al. study is interesting in that it was one of the first studies to demonstrate the impact of situation upon compliance-gaining strategy choice. However, the appearance of many of the same strategies in several or all of the situations makes interpretation of the results less than clear. The large number of strategies employed by subjects across situations and the lack of a coherent structure in the nonintimate, short-term condition suggest the need for a more complete sample of compliance-gaining situations. It may be that the four arbitrarily derived situations, which were imposed on subjects, were not easily distinguishable or were not highly meaningful. A recent failure to replicate the Miller et al. results butresses this speculation (Jackson & Backus, 1982).

Wiseman and Schenck-Hamlin's (1981) attempt to develop a typology of compliance-gaining strategies also suggests the need for a more

complete understanding of how compliance-gaining situations are perceived. They found that compliance-gaining strategies were distinguished in terms of four dimensions and that subjects employed the same criteria in discriminating among strategies in the two situations they used. However, even though only two situations were employed, these researchers found that certain situational factors influenced the weight subjects placed on given dimensions. They note, for example, that situations which are important to persuaders and which do not infringe on their rights are likely to produce reasoning rather than manipulative tactics.

Conclusions such as those by Wiseman and Schenck-Hamlin (1981) and Miller et al. (1977), while certainly helpful, may be premature. Research has yet to define the full range of dimensions which underlie and influence the perception of compliance-gaining situations. Until this is done, no clear understanding of the impact of situation on the choice of compliance-gaining strategies is possible.

A study by Cody and McLaughlin (1980) attempted to examine directly the dimensions of compliance-gaining situations. These researchers asked subjects to write about situations relevant to their social lives. After assessing the situations for redundancies, they came up with eighty-seven nonredundant instances. From this population, three samples of twelve situations each were drawn (with replacement) and presented to a second group of subjects who made similarity judgments which were used in a multidimensional scaling (MDS) analysis. Each subject, then, made judgments on a total of twelve of the original eighty-seven situations.

The MDS produced two dimensions which were replicated at least once: intimacy and resistance. Three other dimensions, personal benefits, dominance, and long-term/short-term consequences, were also obtained although not replicated across samples. These dimensions are to some extent consistent with previous research. Moreover, the results of a recent confirrmatory factor analytic study indicate that college student respondents, at least, can reliably distinguish among these dimensions if presented with items reflecting the dimensional destinctions (Cody, Woelfel, & Jordan, 1983). However, the fact that a given situation sample produced dimensions which were not replicated in other samples indicates that none of the samples contained a sufficient number of situations to tap all the relevant dimensions which may be operating in compliance-gaining attempts. Furthermore, it is possible that the combined samples (they contained thirty-six different situations) were not adequate to tap all relevant dimensions.

Our study extends the work of Cody and McLaughlin. It is expected that the dimensions reported by those researchers will appear in some form here also. However, our intention is to refine their taxonomy and to more nearly exhaustively describe the dimensions underlying compliance-gaining situations (at least for the population from which the subject sample is drawn). We agree with Cody, Woelful, and Jordan's statement: "Future research is needed to explore what other situation factors are relevant to the domain of compliance gaining (1983, p. 109)."

A final general point needs to be made about the argument for a situational approach to the examination of human behavior. Mischel

(1973, p. 254) notes that social learning theory does not discount the importance of individual differences in motivating behavior. This is a point which which we fully concur. On the other hand, personality theorists do not question that behavior varies as a function of situation. We believe that the effects of environment have not been given sufficient weight in the examination of compliance gaining and that a more thorough understanding of such effects is necessary before we can progress in this area.

METHOD

There were two phases in this research. Phase one provided us with a sample of compliance-gaining situations and phase two provided similarity judgments for an MDS. Two respondent samples were employed.

The Collection of Situations

The respondents for this phase of the data collection were 46 male and 51 female students at a large midwestern university who were recruited from the Student Union or in clases. These persons were provided with a set of written instructions and were asked to follow along as these were read to them. They were instructed to: (1) Think of situations in which they had attempted to get someone to do something when the other was initially disinclined to comply or in which someone had attempted to get them to do something. (2) Briefly describe all such situations which had occurred in the past 48 hours or which often occurred in their interactions with others although not within the last two days. (3) Give at least two (but as many as they could think of) descriptive adjectives for each situation they listed.

(4) Indicate their relationship to the other person in the situation (friend, spouse, lover, brother, sister, parent, stranger, etc.).

These respondents produced 217 situations, an average of 2.24 situations per person. There were eleven situations involving parents and small children, e.g. "trying to get my five-year-old son to go to bed." These situations were discarded, because it was assumed that such situations would not be a part of the experience of most of the undergraduate college respondents who would be asked to make the similarity judgments in phase two. The remaining 206 situations were written on individual cards and submitted to three communication-research graduate students for the purpose of eliminating re-redundant cases. These persons were instructed to indicate any situations which, in their judgment, were exactly like another situation. They worked individually. Only situations which all three judges agreed were exactly like another situation were removed. For example, the situation "trying to persuade a friend to go out and drink beer with you" was judged to be the same as "trying to get a friend to go out and drink with you." Sixty-one situations were judged to be redundant, which left 145 non-redundant situations. These were given a common sentence structure (the prefix "trying to persuade," followed by the target of the persuasion, and the description of the object of the persuasion).

It was judged inadvisable, if not impossible, to expect respondents to make accurate judgments of similarity of 145 situations. Thus, the entire population of situations was divided into three sets. The assignment of situations to a given set was accomplished by a ran-

dom process. Set one was assigned forty-nine situations, while sets two and three were assigned forty-eight situations each.

The Multidimensional Scaling

One hundred forty-nine persons, 70 males and 79 females, made similarity judgments of the situations. Respondents were undergraduates at a small midwestern university who participated individually or in small groups of two or three persons. Forty-nine respondents made similarity judgments of set one situations, while sets two and three employed 50 respondents each. An envelope containing 48/49 situations and a set of rating scales for each situation was given to each person. Respondents were asked to scrutinize each situation and try to imagine themselves as participants. They were then instructed to sort the situations into piles of similar situations. When they completed their sort, they were asked to re-examine their groupings to make sure that all situations were correctly placed, then to record their choices on a record sheet. Finally, they were asked to rate each situation on eight bipolar, seven-point scales.

The scales were obtained from previous compliance-gaining research and from the adjectives listed by the respondents who generated the situations. The five scales derived from previous studies were: "I have a right to make this request/I have no right to make this request" (Cody & McLaughlin, 1980), "I am uncertain/I am certain" (Cody & McLaughlin, 1980; Schlenker & Tedeschi, 1972), "I will personally benefit/the other will benefit" (Miller et al., 1977), "The effects are long-term/the effects are short-term" (Miller et al., 1977), and "I dominate/the other dominates" (Cody & McLaughlin,

1980; Schlenker & Tedeschi, 1972). The three scales derived from the respondents' free response adjectives were: "I get angry/I remain calm," "I become frustrated/I am satisfied," and "I am tense/I am relaxed."

The MDS program used was the ALSCAL procedure provided by the SAS package. Two- through five-dimensional solutions were obtained for all three data sets. In order to determine which solution best fit the data, two analyses were employed: (1) an examination of the stress values provided by the ALSCAL program and (2) a visual examination to determine the interpretability of the different solutions.

The most common method of dimensional interpretation is a visual examination of the configuration and the coordinates of the stimulus objects (Kruskal & Wish 1978, p. 54). To aid the visual interpretation, the ratings on the bipolar scales were were correlated with the coordinates of the stimulus objects on each of the dimensions. To further assist in the dimensional interpretations, a hierarchical cluster analysis was performed. It is expected that items which load on a dimension will also be located in the same neighborhood by the cluster analysis. Since it seems likely that any given dimension will include several clusters, an examination of the within-dimension clusters should provide a more precise interpretation of the dimension. The optimal number of clusters in a data set was determined to be at the point where the mean within-cluster distance increased sharply (Everitt, 1974).

RESULTS

Optimal interpretability was achieved on all three data sets with

the four dimensional solution. The stress values for the two- through five-dimensional solutions were: for set one, .309, .205, .148, and .116; set two, .292, .191, .152, and .119; set three, .299, .213, .152, and .113. The optimal number of clusters for each data set was determined to be eleven clusters for set one, fourteen clusters for set two, and twelve clusters for set three.

The three data sets produced five distinct dimensions, three of which were reproduced across all three sets. The five dimensions were labeled: (1) Resistance to Persuasion, (2) Values/Rules, (3) Gender Relevant/Gender Irrelevant, (4) Dominance, and (5) Long-term/Short-term effects.

The Resistance to Persuasion Dimension

Table 1 displays the situations and dimension loadings for the Resistance to Persuasion dimension (Note: all tables display situations grouped according to clusters). This dimension seems to distinguish situations where some level of resistance to the persuasive attempt is expected. Situations loading on one pole of the dimension seem to be those which would cause rather high levels of resistance, while those loading on the other pole seem likely to cause much lower levels of resistance. Supporting this interpretation are the scale items relating to resistance, which correlated with the dimensional cordinates: "I get angry/I remain calm," correlated with the resistance dimension in set one, $r = -.603$, $p < .0001$; "I become frustrated/I am satisfied," correlated with the resistance dimension in sets one and two, $r = -.667$, $p < .0001$ and $r = .632$, $p < .0001$ respectively; and "I am tense/I am relaxed," correlated with the dimension

in sets one and two, $r = -.635$, $p < .0001$ and $r = .713$, $p < .0001$ respectively. None of the scale items correlated with the resistance dimension in set three. No other scale items correlated with the dimension in any set.

TABLE 1 HERE

Alternatively, this dimension might be interpreted in terms of level of intimacy involved. Indeed, if data from set one only is considered, level of intimacy might be the preferred interpretation. In set one, situations locating at the positive pole are clearly less intimate than situations loacting at the negative pole.

There are, however, several reasons for selecting the resistance-to-persuasion interpretation. First, when set two and set three are examined, the reader will see intimate and non-intimate situations clustered at both poles. Second, if intimacy were the best interpretation, it would be expected that the most intimate situations would load highest on one pole, while the least intimate situations would load highest on the other pole. An examination of the situations shows that this is not the case. Third, the cluster analysis shows that the distinction between more or less intimate interactions appears in several dimensions throughout all three data sets. In most cases, however, this distinction seems to delineate fine nuances within the dimension rather than being the factor which characterizes it.

Note that level of intimacy might be perceived in terms of the relationship of the interactants or in terms of the subject matter of the interaction. This seems to come through fairly clearly in the clusters which comprise the dimension. Situations 87 and 113 seem to

be less intimate than situations 4, 20, 32, and 104. Except for situation 32 (the Mormon missionary) the intimacy seems to be based on the relationship itself. That is, persons may be more intimate with bosses and teachers than with clerks. Situation 32 seems to be intimate in terms of the subject matter. One's religious views are likely to be a fairly intimate topic. These situations, however, seem to be less intimate than situations 19, 67, 85, 91, and 115, which deal with intimate relationships (parents) and intimate subjects (finances and family behavior). Situations 51 and 79 and situations 81, 86, and 119 describe intimate relationships (parents and spouse/lovers) but deal with less intimate subjects.

At the other pole of the dimension, the same sort of distinction appears. Situations 18, 45, 59, and 127 involve spouse/lover or boy/girlfriend interactions and seem to be intimate in terms of the relationship itself. The other situations on this pole deal with less intimate relationships (roommates and friends). Some of these clusters of situations, however, deal with fairly intimate topics (e.g. situations 68, 108, and 110). The clusters then seem to support and more or less "fine tune" the resistance-to-persuasion interpretation.

The Values/rules Dimension

Table 2 displays the situation descriptions and coordinate loadings for the situations comprising the Values/Rules dimension. This dimension seems to distinguish situations which relate to the values and rules by which individuals conduct their daily interactions. At one pole of the dimension are situations in which the target is asked to violate some value he/she holds or some rule which is imposed on

the target by the target's role. Librarians and waitresses may or may not have internalized values concerning borrowing books or dress in the establishment. Nevertheless, these are the rules by which they must conduct their occupational affairs. Teachers, on the other hand, probably hold some internalized value concerning the amount of work assigned to students.

In the situations loading on the other pole, targets are not asked to violate some value they hold. Rather, they are asked to accept some value held by the requestor. Furthermore, it seems as if the requestor attributes the value to the target or at least assumes that the target should accept the value. The target is asked NOT to do something which is wrong, NOT to use obscene language, or NOT to drink too much. The requestor seems to be saying: "Obey me....it's for your own good."

This interpretation is particularly clear among set-one situations and is supported by the strong correlation between the scale "I benefit/the other benefits" with the dimensional coordinates of set-one situations ($r = -.803$, $p < .0001$). No other scale items correlated with this dimension.

TABLE 2 HERE

In sets two and three the correlation between the "benefits" scale and the dimensional coordinates did not occur. However, notice that in set one those requests in which the requestor asks the target to accept the requestor's values contain a strong element of altruism. For sets two and three, some of the situations are altruistic: situations 23, 49, 141, 84, 86, and 118. However, the other situa-

tions on the dimension are requests which primarily benefit the requestor. These groups of situations were distinguished by the cluster analysis as individual clusters. Thus, the cluster analysis supports the notion that altruism or personal benefits is an element of the dimension but not the factor which characterizes it.

Although other researchers have concluded that altruism is an element which distinguishes compliance-gaining situations (Cody & McLaughlin, 1980; Marwell & Schmitt, 1967; Miller et al., 1977), this element may be subsumed under a more general factor relating to the values of the interactants and the rules which bind them together. The finding of this study is that (at some level) altruistic and non-altruistic requests which involve personal values are seen as similar. If this is true, personal benefit clearly is not the distinguishing factor.

The clusters on the "target's values" pole seem to distinguish situations on the basis of target's role (parents, co-workers, clerks, teachers, etc.) and if the data sets are considered separately an element of intimacy emerges. However, intimate and non-intimate situations appear on both poles of the dimension and the more intimate situations do not load highest on the dimension. As with dimension one, the cluster analysis supports the notion that intimacy is an element within the dimension.

The Gender Relevant/Gender Irrelevant Dimension

Table three displays the situation description and coordinate loadings for the Gender Relevant/Gender Irrelevant dimension. This dimension seems to distinguish between situations where the sex of the

interactants is an important factor and situations where it is not important. In the situations loading on the gender irrelevant pole, the gender of the target vis-a-vis the gender of the requestor is not clear. For those situations loading on the gender-relevant pole, however, the relationship is clearly opposite-sex.

TABLE 3 HERE

The clusters of situations on the gender-relevant pole seem to support the interpretation. While the gender of the interactants is important in all of the situations loading on this pole, it seems more important in the situations loading highest on the dimension within their respective data sets. Note particularly situations 38, 39, 112, and 143 from set-one and situations 27, 94, 117, and 144 from set-three. This, of course, is what one would expect given the interpretation suggested here.

This interpretation is made somewhat tentatively because none of the scale items correlated with the dimensional coordinates. On the other hand, given the absence of scales pertaining to gender, this pattern might be supportive.

On the gender-irrelevant pole, the situations seem to deal with role-based requests for targets to fulfill their responsibilities as roommates, friends, and neighbors. Within each data set, the clusters seem to distinguish situations on the basis of the personal nature of the requests. Examine the three clusters which comprise the gender-irrelevant pole of data set two: situations 31, 121, and 137; 5, 36, 66, 92, 130, and 138; 73, 100, 120, and 123. The requests in each of these clusters seem to be of an increasingly more personal na-

ture. The other clusters of situations on this pole seem to be distinguished similarly.

The Dominance Dimension

Table four displays the situation descriptions and coordinate loadings for the Dominance dimension. This dimension emerged from the data in sets one and three. It appears to distinguish between situations where the target of the persuasion attempt is dominant and situations involving equal relationships.

If only set-one data are examined, this interpretation is less than clear-cut. Given the interpretation, we would expect the scale item "I dominate/the other dominates" to correlate with the dimension. In set one the correlation did not occur (.16, n.s.).

Nevertheless, there are elements of equal vs. unequal realtionships in this dimension. For example, if only situations 17, 22, 76, and 109 are examined, we find the rating on the "dominance" scale to be 4.65, which is above the overall mean on this scale, 3.76. This rating is also higher than the mean for those items loading at the other end of the dimension, 3.50. However, for situations 4 and 140 respondents saw themselves as more dominant than the target. The mean rating on the "dominance" scale for situations 4 and 140 is 3.07.

In data-set three, the relationship between dominance and the dimension is clearer than in set one. The "dominance" scale correlated with the dimensional coordinates at $r = .626$, ($p < .0001$). No other scale items correlated with this dimension.

The cluster analysis coincides with the MDS. The situations loadings on the target dominant pole located in only three clusters: two

for set one and one for set three. Note that situations 4 and 140, the two situations which do not clearly fit the interpretation, were distinguished from the others by the cluster analysis.

TABLE 4 HERE

On the equal relationships pole, the cluster analysis again distinguished three clusters: one for set three and two for set one. The factor which distinguishes the clusters may be intimacy.

The Long-Term/Short-Term Effects Dimension

Table 5 displays the situation descriptions and coordinate loadings for the Long-Term/Short-Term Effects dimension. This dimension emerged only in data-set two. It distinguishes requests that might have long-term effects from those which might produce short-term effects. This interpretation is supported by the correlation between the scale item "the effects are long-term/the effects are short-term" and the dimension ($r = -.538$, $p < .0002$). No other scale items correlated. This outcome is consistent with both Cody and McLaughlin (1980) and Miller et al. (1977). This dimension did not yield clean within-dimension clusters. Situations 23 and 49 comprise a cluster and seem to separate brother/sister interactions from those involving friends, roommates, and boy/girlfriends. The other situations loading on this dimension were located in various clusters.

TABLE 5 HERE

DISCUSSION

Table 6 summarizes the dimensions derived fom the three data sets and the clusters located within the dimensions. Note that three of the dimensions appear in all three data sets, that one dimension ap-

pears in two of the sets, and that several of the clusters are repeated across and within dimensions. Perhaps the clusters indicate more specific but less important categories in the respondents' judgmental space for compliance-gaining situations.

TABLE 6 HERE

One advantage of the present study over previous research on situational judgments is the large number of situations employed. Forgas (1976), who examined the perception of social episodes in general rather than looking specifically at compliance-gaining situations, employed two sets of twenty-five situations. Each set was applied to a different population (housewives and students). Cody and McLaughlin (1980) examined perceptions of compliance-gaining episodes, employing thirty-six situations which were divided into three sets of twelve situations each. The present study examined 147 different situations: two sets of forty-eight situations each and one set of forty-nine situations.

The number of situations employed may account for the differences between the numbers of dimensions reported by previous researchers and the number obtained in the present study. Forgas, for example, found that two dimensions best described the data from his student population and that three dimensions best described his housewife data. Cody and McLaughlin, studying only one population (undergraduate students), reported two dimensions in two of their data sets and three in the other. Our three data sets were each characterized in terms of four dimensions. More importantly, the wide range of situations used in our study increases the likelihood: (1) that the major dimensions of

everyday compliance-gaining situations have been exhausted for this type of respondent; (2) that the obtained dimensions are highly general; and (3) that the obtained dimensions are highly consensual. On the other hand, there is a reduction of the likelihood that the obtained dimensions are artifacts of irrelevant stimulus features, e.g. the specific words used to describe particular situations (cf. Bradac, 1963; Jackson & Jacobs, 1983).

It also appears that the larger number of situations in conjunction with the hierarchical cluster analysis permitted a more thorough and detailed interpretation of the dimensions. This can be illustrated by comparing the dimensions reported by Cody and McLaughlin and those reported in the present study. (table 7 displays the dimensions obtained by Cody & McLaughlin.)

TABLE 7 HERE

The present study employed situations similar to those used by Cody and McLaughlin. In fact, the two studies used the same method of collecting situations. However, there are some differences in the studies' results. Take, for example, our gender relevant/gender irrelevant, dimension as it emerged in set two (table 3). Intimate and non-intimate situations appear on both poles of the dimension. For example, intimate situations appear on the gender-relevant pole such as "friend to respond to you sexually" and "spouse/lover that you should go to a party together" along with fairly non-intimate situations such as "roommate to pay his/her share of the rent." Likewise, on the gender-irrelevant pole, there are degrees of intimacy. For example, "friend to stop talking too loud about a personal matter" and

"roommate to stop and listen to you" seem to be rather personal interactions, while "friend to let you have a library book first" and roommate not to bring in food while you are dieting" seem to be less personal. This phenomenon (situations exhibiting degrees of intimacy loading on both poles) occurred for several dimensions throughout the three data sets. Other clear examples can be found in the resistance to persuasion dimension as it emerged in data sets one and two and the values/rules dimension as it emerged in data set three. Thus the hierarchial cluster analysis coupled with the wide range of situations revealed a level of structure within the larger structure yielded by the MDS. An implication is that there may be different kinds of intimate/non-intimate distinctions perceived by compliance gainers. For example, intimate situations where gender is most salient may differ from intimate situations where values/rules assume prominence. In contrast Cody and McLaughlin's (1980) study, which used fewer situations and which did not use cluster analysis, yielded a simple intimacy dimension in two of the three data sets.

There are several other differences between the findings reported by Cody and McLaughlin and those of the present study. Cody and McLaughlin's personal benefits dimension distinguished requests which seem to be altruistic in nature and requests which seem to benefit the requestor only. In the present study, situations similar to these joined with others to form the values/rules dimension (Table 2). In order to understand the interpretation fully, the values/rules dimension from all three data sets must be examined. If one were to examine data set one only, for example, one might interpret the dimension

in terms of personal benefits. In fact, the scale relating to "personal benefits" correlated with this dimension in set one. However, when similar dimensions in sets two and three (where the "personal benifits" scale did not correlate) are examined, a different interpretation seems more accurate. The suggested interpretation is that of values/rules.

This suggests that intimacy and benefits for example may not be major, independent dimensions of compliance-gaining situations. Rather, they may be factors which interact with other more general factors, such as values and gender, to determine perceptions of the situation.

Three of the dimensions delineated in this study appeared consistently across the three data sets. The implication is that these are independent factors and that they exhaust a portion of the domain of compliance-gaining situations for persons like the subjects who participated in our study. Similar studies (Cody, 1978; Cody & McLaughlin, 1980; Forgas, 1976) have found that dimensions which emerged in one data set often merged with another dimension in another data set. Possible reasons for this are that these studies failed to employ a sufficient number of situations in each set to tap the major judgmental dimensions in the population of situations and that this insufficiency allowed idiosyncratic effects of specific items (e.g. particular wordings) to obscure the true distinctions.

Finally, although our dimensions and dimensional interpretations differ somewhat from those offered by Cody and McLaughlin (1980), there are points of agreement. These are important, for they repre-

sent patterns which have transcended irrelevant sources of variation (researchers, subject samples, item wordings, etc.). The clearest point of agreement is this: expected degree of target resistance to the compliance-gaining attempt is a pervasive dimension in college students' construals of compliance-gaining situations. Where persons expect high resistance, they may use one sort of strategy; where they expect low resistance, they may use another sort. Or, more likely, the connection between perceived resistance and choice of persuasive strategy may vary with communicator style and personality (Bradac, Sandell, & Wenner, 1979). It seems to us that researchers can now assume that for many college students resistance is a basic situational discriminator with good reason and can now study the impact of different levels of anticipated resistance on the selection of compliance-gaining messages. To the best of our knowledge, no research has examined in detail the effect of anticipated resistance per se on the choice of compliance-gaining strategies and the encoding of compliance-gaining messages. The results of our study and those of Cody and McLaughlin (1980) sugest that this is a serious ommission.

More tentatively, researchers can make another assumption: values/rules, target gender, and dominance are additional general and pervasive dimensions for persons construing persuasive situations. The effect of these situational distinctions upon the choices of compliance gainers should be examined also. On the other hand, perhaps researchers should assume that short-term/long-term consequences, the situational distinction most frequently employed in previous research, is not a highly salient dimension, for in the six replications con-

ducted thus far this dimension has surfaced only twice. Either we should attempt to specify under what circumstances the long-term/short-term distinction is important or, perhaps more usefully we should turn our attention to the more pervasive dimensions as we explore situational influences upon strategies of compliance gaining.

REFERENCES

Argyle, M. & Little, B.R. Do personality traits apply to social behavior? Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior, 1972, 2, 1-35

Berger, C.R., Gardner, R.R., Parks, M.R., Schulman, L., & Miller, G.R. Interpersonal epistemology and interpersonal communication. In G.R. Miller (Ed.), Explorations in interpersonal communication. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1976

Bowers, K.S. Situationism in psychology: An analysis and a critique. Psychological Review, 1973, 80, 307-366

Bradac, J.J., Sandell, K.L., & Wenner, L.A. The phenomenology of evidence: Information-source utility in decision making. Communication Quarterly, 1979, 27, 35-46

Bradac, J.J., Schneider, M.J., Hemphill, M.R. & Trrdy, C.H. Consequences of language intensity and compliance-gaining strategies in an intitial heterosexual encounter. In H. Giles, W.P. Robinson, & P. Smith (Eds.), Language: Social psychological perspectives. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1980

Bradac, J.J. A rose by another name: Attitudinal consequences of lexical variation. In E.B. Ryan & H. Giles (Eds.), Attitudes toward language variation: Social and applied contexts. London: Edward Arnold Publishers, 1982

Bradac, J.J. On generalizing cabbages, messages, kings, and several other things: The virtues of multiplicity. Human Communication Research, 1983, 9, 181-187.

Cody, M.J. A multidimensional scaling of naturalistic persuasion situations. Paper presented to the Speech Communication Association Convention, November, 1978

Cody, M.J. & McLaughlin, M.L. Perceptions of compliance-gaining situations: A dimensional analysis. Communication Monographs, 1980, 47, 132-148

Cody, M.J., Woelfel, M.L. & Jordan, W.J. Dimensions of compliance-gaining situations. Human Communication Research, 1983, 9, 181-187

Clark, R.A. The impact of self interest and desire for liking on the selection of communicative strategies. Communication Monographs, 1979, 46, 257-273

Dickman, H.R. The perception of behavioral units. In R.G. Baker

(Ed.), The stream of behavior. New York: Appleton-Centry-Crofts, 1963

Endler, N.S. & Magnusson, D. (Eds.), Interactional psychology and personality. Washington: Hemisphere Publishing Company, 1976

Everitt, B. Cluster analysis. London: Heineman Educational Books, 1974

Falbo, T. Multidimensional scaling of power strategies. Journal of personality and Social Psychology, 1977, 35, 537-547

Fitzpatrick, M.A. & Winke, J. You always hurt the one you love: Strategies and tactics in interpersonal conflict. Communication Quarterly, 1979, 27, 2-11

Forgas, J.P. The perception of social episodes: Categorical and dimensional representations in two different social milieus. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1976, 34, 199-209

Forgas, J.P. Social episodes and social structure in an academic setting: The social environment of an intact group. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1978, 14, 434-448

French, R.P. Jr. & Raven, B. The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright & A. Zander (Eds.), Group dynamics. New York: Harper and Row, 1960

Giles, H. & Hewstone, M. Cognitive structures, speech, and social situations: Two integrative models. Language Sciences, 1982, 4, 187-219

Hornstein, H.A. The effects of different magnitudes of threat upon interpersonal bargaining. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1965, 1, 282-283

Jackson, S. & Backus, D. Are compliance-gaining strategies dependent on situational variables? Central States Speech Journal, 1982, 33, 469-479

Jackson, S. & Jacobs, s. Generalizing about messages: Suggestions for design and analysis of experiments. Human Communication Research, 1983, 9, 169-181

Kruskal, J.B. & Wish, M. Multidimensional scaling. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1978

Lawler, E.J. & Bacharach, S.B. Outcome alternatives and value as criteria for multistrategy evaluations. Journal of personality and Social Psychology, 1976, 34, 885-894

Leibowitz, K., Bochner, A., Rawlins, W., & Eagle, L. Patterns of

exchange and attraction in close, equal and unequal friendships. Paper submitted to the Speech Communication Association Convention, Washington, D.C., 1977

Marwell, G. & Schmitt, D. Dimensions of compliance-gaining behavior: An empirical analysis. Social Psychology, 1967, 30, 353-364

McLaughlin, M.L., Cody, M.J., & Robey, C.S. Situational influences on the selection of strategies to resist compliance-gaining at tempts. Human Communication Research, 1980, 7, 14-36

Miller, G., Boster, F., Roloff, M., & Seibold, D. Compliance-gaining message strategies: A typology and some findings concerning effects of situational differences. Communication Monographs, 1977, 44, 36-51

Mischel, W. Toward a cognitive social learning reconceptualization of personality. Psychological Review, 1973, 80, 252-283

Moos, R.H. Conceptualizations of human environments. American Psychologist, 1973, 28, 652-655

Moos, R.H. & Insel, P.M. (Eds.), Issues in social ecology: Human Milieus. Palo Alto, CA: National Press Books, 1974

Roloff, M.E. & Barnicott, D.F. Jr. The influence of dogmatism on the situational use of pro- and anti-social compliance-gaining strategies. Southern Speech Communication Journal, 1979, 45, 37-54

Schenck-Hamlin, W.J., Wiseman, R.L., & Georgacrakos, G.N. A model of properties of compliance-gaining strategies. Communication Quarterly, 1982, 30, 92-100

Schlenker, B. & Tedeschi, J.T. Interpersonal attraction and the use of reward and coercive power. Human Relations 1972, 25, 427-440

Sillars, A.L. The stranger and the spouse as target persons for compliance-gaining strategies: A subjective expected utility model. Human Communication Research, 1980, 6, 265-279

Wiseman, R.L. & Schenck-Hamlin, W J. A multidimensional scaling validation of an inductively-derived set of compliance-gaining strategies. Communication Monographs, 1981, 48, 252-270

Wish, M., D'Andrade, R.G. & Goodnow II, J.E. Dimensions of interpersonal communication: Correspondences between structures for speech acts and bipolar scales. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1980, 39, 848-860.

Wish, M., Deutsch, M., & Kaplan, S.J. Perceived dimensions of interpersonal relations. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1976, 33, 409-420

Wish, M. & Kaplan, S.J. Toward an implicit theory of communication. Sociometry, 1977, 40, 234-246

Table 1

Situation Description and Dimension Loading for All Data Sets: Resistance to Persuasion Dimension

Sit. No.	Set	Situation Description	Loading
		High Resistance Pole	
4	1	Boss not to insist that you go out with him/her.	1.60
20	1	Prospective employer that you can do a job for which he/she is taking applications.	1.83
32	1	Mormon missionary that he should not come into your home and preach.	2.12
104	1	Teacher to reduce an assignment.	1.05
87	1	Phone company clerk that you had already paid their bill.	1.76
113	1	Clerk that she/he charged you too much.	1.90
25	2	Waiter at Godfather's to make a pizza for you at closing time.	-0.92
88	2	Clerk at Sears to order a replacement dryer for one which did not work properly.	-1.19
142	2	Bouncer to let you in a bar when you don't have your ID.	-1.34
19	2	Parents that you should be allowed to stay out longer than they wanted.	-1.55
67	2	Mother/father not to expect you for dinner with the family.	-1.62
85	2	Mother/father that you should stay at school over the weekend.	-1.05
91	2	Mother/father to stop questioning you about finances.	-1.35
115	2	Mother/father to lend you some money.	-1.07
6	2	Policeman not to give you a ticket.	-1.66
8	2	Teacher that you do not need to study more.	-1.68
9	2	Boss that you should not have to work on a day	-1.56

Table 1 (cont.)

		when you are not scheduled to work.	
63	2	Professor to raise your grade on a test.	-1.98
135	2	Professor not to assign so much homework.	-1.72
51	3	Spouse/lover to concent to buying furniture.	1.65
79	3	Spouse/lover to ask for help with housework when he/she wants help.	1.67
81	3	Parents to let you live away from home.	1.82
86	3	Mother/father to see a doctor.	1.93
119	3	Parents to buy a secondhand piano for you.	1.66

Low Resistance Pole

18	1	Spouse/lover to do housework while you go to work.	-1.19
45	1	Spouse/lover to make dinner.	-1.42
59	1	Spouse/lover to put up the volleyball net immediately.	-1.08
127	1	Boy/girlfriend to do your laundry.	-1.36
68	1	Friend that you should use his/her car to drive to the party.	-1.20
108	1	Friend to drive while you rest.	-1.27
110	1	Friend to lend you his/her typewriter for a month.	-1.20
114	1	Roommate to agree to your getting a cat.	-1.20
33	1	Roommate to take a walk with you.	-1.29
44	1	Friend to o joging with you.	-1.29
126	1	Roommate to help with the laundry.	-1.51
136	1	Friend to help you with some work.	-1.51
139	1	Roommate to o to the library with you.	-1.52
13	2	Roommate to go and study with you.	1.76
16	2	Friend to go bowling.	1.99
29	2	Friend to put off studying and join you for beers.	1.71
35	2	Friend to go to a concert with you.	1.90
75	2	Friend to leave a party and go to a bar.	1.52
107	2	Friends to go to a movie with you.	1.81
24	3	Friend to go out and drink with you.	-1.24
41	3	Friend to cut class.	-1.47
77	3	Friend to go to the circus with you.	-1.04

Table 1 (cont.)

122	3	Friend to go water-skiing with you.	-0.98
128	3	Friend to help play a practical joke on another friend.	-1.26

Table 2

Situation Description and Dimension Loadings for All Data Sets: Values/Rules Dimension

Sit. No.	Set	Situation Description	Loading
		Target's Values Pole	
30	1	Librarian to give you a book when you don't have your ID.	1.58
69	1	Librarian to allow you to take books out of the reserve room.	1.59
93	1	Waitress at a restaurant that you should be allowed in, even though you do not meet the dress requirements.	1.44
141	1	Librarian to find a microfisch copy when you don't have the proper description.	1.44
21	1	Co-worker to fill-in for you for a short time even though he/she is quite busy.	1.61
104	1	Teacher to reduce an assignment.	1.31
25	2	Waiter at Godfather's to make you a pizza at closing time.	1.34
88	2	Clerk at Sears to order a replacement dryer for one which did not work properly.	1.72
142	2	Bouncer to let you in a bar when you don't have your ID.	1.06
11	2	Co-worker to help you with some work.	1.53
57	2	Boss that you can't finish a work project by the deadline.	1.06
6	2	Policeman not to ive you a ticket.	1.32
63	2	Professor to raise your grade on a test.	0.95
134	2	Professor not to assign so much homework.	1.00
10	3	Brother/sister to mow the lawn for you.	-1.52
61	3	Brother/sister to hang up the phone so you can use it.	-1.84
71	3	Co-worker to speak to the boss for you.	-0.83
111	3	Co-worker to work a day for you when he/she had other plans.	-1.00

Table 2 (cont.)

124	3	Brother/sister to lend you a small amount of money.	-1.22
2	3	Boy/girlfriend to eat at a restaurant you like better than the one he/she suggested.	-1.29
51	3	Spouse/lover to consent to buying furniture.	-0.99
52	3	Spouse/lover to keep the house clean.	-1.28
55	3	Spouse/lover that the air conditioner should be turned on.	-1.68
14	3	Roommate to go to the store and buy groceries.	-1.56
64	3	Friend to leave so that you can study.	-0.85
105	3	Roommate to leave your room, so you can spend some time alone with your boy/girlfriend.	-1.12
133	3	Friend to pick up a book at the library for you.	-1.20
135	3	Friend to type a report for you.	-1.14

Persuader's Values Pole

34	1	Friend to study for a test.	-2.21
65	1	Brother/sister not to use obscene language.	-1.99
70	1	Friend that he should take better care of his/her car.	-2.06
78	1	Brother/sister that he she should not expect you to lie when someone calls on the phone that he/she does not want to talk to.	-1.82
89	1	Spouse/lover not to drink too much.	-1.82
95	1	Members of your class discussion group to come to class prepared.	-1.57
129	1	Friend not to do something which is wrong.	-2.18
19	2	Parents that you should be allowed to stay out later than they want.	-1.37
67	2	Mother/father not to expect you for dinner with with the family.	-1.65
85	2	Mother/father that you stay at school over the weekend.	-1.47
91	2	Mother/father to stop questioning you about finances.	-1.65
115	2	Mother/father to lend you money.	-1.29
23	2	Brother/sister to clean up the house.	-0.83
49	2	Brother/sister to leave home before they wanted to.	-1.47
131	2	Boy/girlfriend not to drink when you go to a bar for dancing.	-1.39

Table 2 (cont.)

37	3	Friend not to challenge your religious beliefs.	1.60
90	3	Stranger at a bar to go away.	1.80
106	3	Friend that you prefer not to take a stimulant.	1.70
116	3	Friend that you do not want to go with him/her to buy an illegal substance.	1.89
84	3	Friend to talk to you about their feelings.	1.24
86	3	Mother/father to see a doctor.	1.37
118	3	Friend to quit smoking.	1.43

Table 3

Situation Description and Dimension Loading for All Data Sets: Gender Relevant/Gender Irrelevent Dimension

Sit. No.	Set	Situation Description	Loading
		Gender Irrelevant Pole	
26	1	Friend to lend you money.	1.00
28	1	Friend to come to a party you are giving when he/she had other plans.	1.09
108	1	Friend to drive while you rest.	0.87
110	1	Friend to lend you his typewriter for a month.	0.92
31	2	Friend who wants the same library book as you to let you have it first.	0.87
121	-2	Roommate not to bring in food while you are trying to diet.	1.71
137	2	Roommate to stop working, turn out the lights, and go to bed.	1.23
5	2	Friend to stop talking too loud about a personal matter.	1.75
36	2	Friend that you cannot go on a vacation trip you had planned.	1.39
66	2	Friend to be on time when picking you up after work.	1.75
92	2	Friend to leave your apartment.	1.56
130	2	Friends that you should not have to take another person in the car on a trip.	1.35
138	2	Friends to stop playing a very active game in your dorm room.	1.70
73	2	Roommate to wash his/her dishes.	1.82
100	2	Roommate to pay his/her share of the rent.	1.87
120	2	Roommate to stop and listen to what you have to say.	1.67
123	2	Roommate that you should not have to sleep in another room so he/she can spend the night with his/her boy/girlfriend.	1.65

Table 3 (cont.)

99	3	Friend that the car, you own jointly, should be sold.	-1.23
125	3	Classmate to work on our class project.	-1.36
80	3	Friend to get a job.	-1.36
84	3	Friend to talk to you about their feelings.	-0.85
118	3	Friend to quit smoking.	-1.21
12	3	Neighbor to turn down the stereo.	-1.52
42	3	Friend, who is always borrowing things, that he/she should not borrow a garden hose.	-1.27
96	3	Roommate to stop leaving dirty pans around.	-1.80

Gender Relevant Pole

1	1	Boy/girlfriend to go just to dinner and not to a movie because you had a speech due.	-1.71
3	1	Boy/girlfriend to go out with you when he/she has a date with another person.	-1,67
54	1	Boy/girlfriend to bet a hunch at the racetrack.	-1.38
103	1	Person of the opposite sex to take an interest in you.	-1.55
38	1	Boy/girlfriend to give you more personal time.	-2.09
39	1	Boy/girlfriend to stop telling you what to do.	-1.92
112	1	Boy/girlfriend that you should go out with other men/women.	-2.26
143	1	Boy/girlfriend to confide in you more.	-1.95
7	2	Boy/girlfriend to go shopping with you.	-1.18
50	2	Spouse/lover to take a day off work.	-1.07
56	2	Spouse/lover that you should go to a party together.	-1.23
58	2	Spouse/lover to go to the 4th of July fireworks.	-1.24
60	2	Boy/girlfriend to go swimming an hour earlier than planned.	-0.87
62	2	Friend to respond to you sexually.	-1.48
27	3	Boy/girlfriend to come home for the weekend when he/she had planned to stay at school.	1.98
94	3	Boy/girlfriend to spend the night at your apartment.	1.81
117	3	Boy/girlfriend to let you spend the night with him/her.	1.65

Table 3 (cont.)

144	3	Boy/girlfriend not to break off your relationship.	1.50

Table 4

Situation Description and Dimension Loading
for Data Sets One and Three:
Dominance Dimension

Sit. No.	Set	Situation Description	Loading
		Target Dominant Pole	
17	1	Mother/father to let you use the car	1.37
22	1	Mother/father that you should not have to do an errand.	2.00
40	1	Mother/father to buy you a new water ski which is on sale.	1.48
76	1	Mother that you don't have time to take her to the store.	2.14
109	1	Mother/father that you should not have to do the dishes.	2.04
4	1	Boss not to insist that you go out with him/her.	1.13
140	1	Some friends that you don't want to go to a movie.	1.16
43	3	Clerk at Sears to exchange a shirt for which you have lost the receipt.	2.11
46	3	Clerk to give you a glass of ice without charging for it.	1.94
48	3	Boss to give you a raise.	1.68
53	3	Water patrol that you should not have to go back inside the buoy while tubing at the reservoir.	1.70
72	3	Professor that you should not have to make revisions on your paper.	2.05
101	3	Vending machine operator that you should be reimbursed when the machine failed to deliver the merchandise.	2.07
102	3	Grocery store owner to allow you to put up a for-sale sign in his store window.	1.94
132	3	Lab leader to dismiss class early.	1.72
145	3	Professor to let you enroll in class late.	2.08
		Equal Relationship Pole	

Table 4 (cont.)

33	1	Roommate to take a walk with you.	-1.20
44	1	Friend to go jogging with you.	-0.96
139	1	Roommate to go to the library with you.	-0.83
47	1	Landlord to repair the dishwasher.	-1.43
87	1	Phone company that you already paid the bill.	-1.23
97	1	Roommate the you should move out.	-1.32
103	1	Person of the opposite sex to take an interest in you.	-1.13
24	3	Friend to go out and drink with you.	-1.24
41	3	Friend to cut class.	-1.36
77	3	Friend to go tothe circus.	-1.18
122	3	Friend to go water-skiing	-1.11
128	3	Friend to help you play a practical joke on another friend.	-1.38

Table 5

Situation Description and Dimension Loading
for Long-Term/Short-Term Effects
Dimension

Sit. No.	Set	Situation Description	Loading
		Long-Term Effects Pole	
74	2	Boy/girlfriend to lose weight.	1.51
83	2	Spouse/lover not to become angry when you meet other people.	1.76
98	2	Other people to see your political views.	1.44
131	2	Boy/girlfriend not to drink too much when you go to a bar for dancing.	1,25
		Short-Term Effects Pole	
15	2	Roommate to watch another TV show.	-1.20
31	2	Friend, who wants the same library book as you, to let you have it first.	-0.98
23	2	Brother/sister to clean up the house.	-1.36
49	2	Brother/sister to leave home before they they wanted to.	-1.01

Table 6

Dimensions and Within-Dimension Clusters Derived From the Three Data Sets

	Dimension			
	1	2	3	4
Set 1	Resistance to persuasion	Values/rules	Gender relevant/ gender irrelevant	Domincance
Set 2	Resistance to persuasion	Gender relevant/ gender irrelevant	Values/rules	Long-term/ short-term effects
Set 3	Dominance	Values/rules	Gender relevant/ gender irrelevant	Resistance to persuasion
	Within Dimension Clusters			
Set 1	Intimacy	One-time vs. on-going relation-ships Casual vs. family relation ships	Trivial vs. important requests	Parents vs. others Intimacy
Set 2	Intimacy	target of the persua-sion attempt	Intimacy	

Table 6 (cont.)

Set 3	Target of the persuasion attempt Intimacy	Intimacy	Intimacy Level of anger aroused	Dominant vs. equal relationships

Table 7

Dimension of Compliance-Gaining Situations, As Reported by Cody And McLaughlin (1980)

Data Set	Dimension Number	Dimension Label
1	1	Intimacy
	2	Personal Benefits
2	1	Resistance/Unfriendly
	2	Intimacy
3	1	Dominance
	2	Short-Term/Long-Term Consequences
	3	Resistance/Unfriendly